

Remarks

The Official Action rejected claims 1-27 and objected to claims 28-30. Applicant has amended claims 2, 3, 6, 10, 11, 18, 19, 22, 25-30 and has cancelled claims 1, 9 and 17. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant gratefully acknowledges that claims 28-30 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. To expedite prosecution, Applicant has rewritten claim 29 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant reserves the right to pursue claims of original scope in a continuation application.

Claims Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11-13, 15-17, 19-21, 23 and 24 under 35. U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Yamamoto et al. ("Using Suffix Arrays to Compute Term Frequency and Document Frequency for All Substrings in a Corpus).

Claims 9, 11-13 and 15-16

Applicant has canceled claim 9, and amended claims 11 and 29 so that each of claims 11-13 and 15-16 includes the allowable claim 29 as a base claim. Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 9, 11-13 and 15-16 be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, 17, 19-21, 23 and 24

Applicant has canceled claim 1 and 17 and amended claims 3 and 19 so that each of claims 3-5, 7-8, 19-21, 23 and 24 includes one of claims 6 and 22 as a base claim. Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, 17, 19-21, 23 and 24 be withdrawn, since Applicant believes claims 6 and 22 are patentable for the following reasons.

Claims Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 2, 10 and 18

The Office Action rejected claims 2, 10 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Yamamoto in view of Applicant's admitted prior art.

Applicant has amended claim 10 to include the allowable claim 29 as a base claim. Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claim 10 be withdrawn.

Applicant has amended claims 2 and 18 to respectively include one of claims 6 and 22 as a base claim. Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 2 and 18 be withdrawn, since Applicant believes claims 6 and 22 are patentable for the following reasons.

Claims 6, 14 and 22

The Office Action rejected claims 6, 14 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto in view of Castellanos et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2003/0014448A1).

As a result of the present amendments, claim 14 includes allowable claim 29 as a base claim. Accordingly, claim 14 is allowable for at least the reasons claim 29 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claim 14 be withdrawn.

Applicant has rewritten claims 6 and 22 in independent form, respectively including all of the limitations of their base claims. Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 6 and 22 be withdrawn for the following reasons.

As discussed in M.P.E.P 2143.03, to establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).

Each of claims 6 and 22 recites that filtering **the set of frequently occurring phrases** includes **comparing a component word of a phrase to a dictionary of common words and excluding the phrase from the set of entity name and jargon term candidates if the component word is a common word**, which is neither taught nor suggested by a combination of Yamamoto and Castellanos.

As conceded in the Office Action, Yamamoto does not teach that filtering the set of frequently occurring phrases includes comparing a component word of a phrase to a dictionary of common words and excluding the phrase from the set of entity name and jargon term candidates if the component word is a common word.

Castellanos teaches a method of normalizing dirty text in documents by creating a thesaurus made of standard terms and their variations and passing the

documents through the thesaurus for normalization. The Office Action appears to rely on paragraph 30 of Castellanos for the teaching of comparing a component word of a phrase to a dictionary of common words and excluding the phrase from the set of entity name and jargon term candidates if the component word is a common word.

Applicant respectfully submits that paragraphs 30-32 teach away from the present application because the reference list includes recognized phrases frequently occurring throughout the selected documents, in which components of the recognized phrases are recognized as correctly spelled. It can be seen that the reference list should include a phrase having a common word that is recognized as correctly spelled. Therefore, the reference list should be different from the set of entity name and jargon term candidates, as claimed by claim 6 of the present application, which excludes a phrase if a component word of the phrase is a common word.

Since neither Yamamoto nor Castellanos teaches or suggests filtering **the set of frequently occurring phrases** includes **comparing a component word of a phrase to a dictionary of common words and excluding the phrase from the set of entity name and jargon term candidates if the component word is a common word**,. Applicant respectfully request the present rejection of claims 6, 14 and 22 be withdrawn.

Claims 25-27

The Office Action rejects claims 25-27 under 35. U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Yamamoto in view of Razin et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,908,034). Each of claims 25-27 include one of claims 6, 29 and 22 as a base claim and are therefore

allowable for at least the reasons stated above. Applicant respectfully requests the present rejection of claims 25-27 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Official Action. Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is requested, and allowance of the pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Should it be determined that an additional fee is due under 37 CFR §§1.16 or 1.17, or any excess fee has been received, please charge that fee or credit the amount of overcharge to deposit account #02-2666. If the Examiner believes that there are any informalities, which can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, a telephone call to the undersigned at (503) 439-8778 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

8/22/06



Gregory D. Caldwell
Registration No. 39,926

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026